

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/799,653

Applicant(s)

KIMURA ET AL.

Examiner

Nicholas D. Rosen

Art Unit

3625

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nicholas D. Rosen.

(3) _____.

(2) Shrinath Malur.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 August 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 42-46.

Identification of prior art discussed: Benson, Haff.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner Rosen told Mr. Malur that he had reviewed the amended claims and remarks, and did not find them entirely unreasonable, although it would be necessary to update the search, and review the case, particularly in light of the KSR decision. Potential amendments were discussed to claims 42-44 to more narrowly define the personal using condition list page. Also, Mr. Malur argued that in Haff, the issue is resuming transmission of an incompletely downloaded file, as opposed to downloading a list from which the user can select a file for downloading. They discussed the possibility of informally preparing several versions of possible claim amendments for consideration.